

REMARKS

1. Applicant thanks Examiner for the telephonic interview on June 15, 2011 and her assistance in the discussion of amendments to the claims. The claims have been amended per our discussion.
2. In the Office Action of Jan 21, 2011, Examiner request affirmation of the provisional election of species given in the telephonic interview. Affirmation of the election of species is on page 2 of this paper.
3. Examiner rejected claims 19, 20, 53 and 54 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.
4. Applicant has amended the specification to include a definition for “filament” which is taken from Random House Webster’s College Dictionary, 2nd edition, 1997.
5. Claims 19, 20, 53 and 54 have also been amended herein to indicate that the conduit is porous.
6. Claims 1-3, 5, 8, 15, 16, 24-33, 37-40, 45 and 51 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,964,740 to Ouchi.
7. Claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 14-17, 24-31, 35-40, 45 and 51 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by US 6,595,958 to Mickley.
8. Claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 14-17, 24-31, 35-40, 45 and 50 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by US 6,595,958 to Mickley.
9. Claims 24-30 and 34 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by US 6,190,353 to Makower et al.
10. Claims 6, 7, 18, 23, 41-44 and 52 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mickley in view of US 6,041,100 to Rowland et al.

11. Claims 9, 13, 46 and 49 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mickley.
12. Claims 6, 7, 18, 23, 41-44 and 52 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mickley in view of Rowland.
13. Claims 19, 20, 53 and 54 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mickley in view of US 6,623,474 to Ponzi.
14. Claims 41-44 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Makower in view of Rowland.
15. Claims 6, 7, 23, 41-44 and 52 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ouchi in view of Rowland.
16. Claims 10-12, 21, 47, 48 and 55 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ouchi in view of US 5,800,484 to Gough et al.
17. As discussed above in Remark 1, the claims have been amended per our discussion in the telephonic interview, and thus we submit the claims are novel and nonobvious over the prior art.

CONCLUSION

For all the reasons above, Applicant submits that the claims all define novel subject matter that is nonobvious. Therefore, allowance of these claims is submitted to be proper and is respectfully requested.

Applicant invites the Examiner to contact Applicant's representative as listed below for a telephonic interview if so doing would expedite the prosecution of the application.

Very respectfully submitted,

/Carol D. Titus/

Carol D. Titus
GSS Law Group
3900 Newpark Mall Rd
Third Floor, Suite 317
Newark, CA 94560

Reg. No. 38,436
Phone (510) 742-7417
Fax (510) 742-7419